



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 1, 2005

Mr. Michael Shaunessy  
Shaunessy, Burnett & Greenberg, P.C.  
114 West Seventh Street, Suite 1000  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2005-00950

Dear Mr. Shaunessy:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 218138.

Hays County (the "county"), which you represent, received two requests for information related to a named county employee. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information was created after the first request for information was received. To the extent the submitted information was created after the county received the first request, it is not responsive to that request and need not be released to that requestor. See *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986) (governmental body not required to disclose information that did not exist at time request was received).

Next we note that the submitted information includes a completed investigation and evaluation made of, for, or by the county. Section 552.022 of the Government Code provides that "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also assert section 552.024, this section does not except information from release, but instead allows for governmental employees to elect to have specific personal information kept confidential.

governmental body” constitutes “public information . . . not excepted from required disclosure . . . unless . . . expressly confidential under other law” or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). You do not claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108. You assert instead that it may be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. This section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body’s interests and is therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Thus, the completed investigation and evaluation may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.103. However, you also claim that some of the information subject to section 552.022 is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102, which do constitute other law for purposes of section 552.022, and we will consider whether these exceptions apply.

However, we first address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov’t Code § 552.103(a), (c). The county has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The county must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). This office has also concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state that the county anticipates litigation based on one employee's complaint and/or the termination of another employee. However, you do not inform us that either individual has threatened to file suit against the county and have not otherwise provided any concrete evidence showing that either individual has taken objective steps toward filing suit against the county. Having considered your representations and reviewed the submitted documents, we conclude that you have not established that the county reasonably anticipated litigation when it received these requests. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986) (whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on case-by-case basis). Accordingly, we find that the submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 and may not be withheld on that basis.

We note, however, that the submitted information includes certified agendas of executive sessions of the Hays County Commissioners Court. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision" and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Section 551.104(c) of the Government Code provides that "[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying *only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3).*" (Emphasis added.) Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 (1988). Therefore, you must withhold the certified agendas of the closed sessions under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code.

We next address your claim under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by common law privacy. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code

§ 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. We will therefore consider your claims regarding section 552.101 and section 552.102 together.

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. 540 S.W.2d at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: an individual's criminal history when compiled by a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision No. 565 (citing *United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989)); personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation into allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the accused individual responding to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.*

When there is an adequate summary of a sexual harassment investigation, the summary must be released along with the statement of the accused, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. A portion of the submitted information relates to an investigation of sexual harassment. The

information includes an adequate summary of the investigation. In accordance with the holding in *Ellen*, the county must release the summary. However, prior to releasing this document, in accordance with section 552.101 and the holding in *Ellen*, the county must redact the information we have marked that identifies any victims or witnesses. The remaining information pertaining to the sexual harassment investigation must likewise be withheld under sections 552.101 and 552.102 and the holding in *Ellen*. We have marked the documents accordingly.

We also note that a portion of the remaining submitted information may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). However, information that is responsive to a request may not be withheld from disclosure under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee did not request confidentiality for this information in accordance with section 552.024 or if the request for confidentiality under section 552.024 was not made until after the request for information was received by the governmental body. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is received by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). If the employee in question timely elected to keep her personal information confidential, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The county may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential. We have marked the information that may be subject to section 552.117.

The submitted information includes a social security number that may be confidential under federal law. Section 552.101 also encompasses amendments to the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), that make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). We have no basis for concluding that the social security number at issue is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Government Code imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing any social security number information, you should ensure that such information is not obtained or maintained by the county pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

In summary, the county must withhold the certified agendas from executive sessions of the Hays County Commissioners Court under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code. After redacting information

that identifies witnesses or victims, under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common law right of privacy, the county must release the marked summary of the sexual harassment investigation. The remaining portion of the sexual harassment investigation and other information we have marked must be withheld pursuant to sections 552.101 and 552.102 in conjunction with the common law right to privacy. We have marked the information that may be subject to section 552.117 if that section applies. A social security number may be confidential under federal law. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be

sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



L. Joseph James  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 218138

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jennifer Biundo  
Free Press  
c/o Shaunessy, Burnett & Greenberg, P.C.  
114 West Seventh Street, Suite 1000  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Genevieve Klein  
The News Dispatch  
1975 Aquarena Springs Drive, #711  
San Marcos, Texas 78666